

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The final Office Action of January 23, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and this response addresses the Examiner's concerns stated in the Office Action. All objections and rejections are respectfully traversed. Applicants appreciate the explanations provided in the Office Action.

### **I. TIMELY FILING**

The Final Rejection was mailed on January 23, 2006. Thus this response is timely filed with no extension of time required on April 23, 2006. However, April 23, 2006 falls on a Sunday, so this response is timely filed on April 24, 2006.

### **II. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, and 17-20 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, and 17-20 have been amended to place the claims in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-9 and 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Barrick et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,006,260, issued on December 21, 1999 (Barrick).

Claims 10 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The previous rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been overcome.

The previous rejection of claims 1-20 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting has been overcome.

### **III. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

On page 4, the Office Action states that claims 10 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have rewritten claims 10 and 20 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims (1 and 11 respectively) and intervening claims (6 and 16 respectively).

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Applicants assert that claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, and 17-20 are currently in condition for allowance.

Although no new fees are anticipated, the Commissioner for Patents is authorized to charge any further additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1078.

The following information is presented in the event that a call may be deemed desirable by the Examiner:

JACOB N. ERLICH (617) 854-4000

Respectfully submitted,  
Ellen M. Nelson et al., Applicants

Date: April 24, 2006

By:



Jacob N. Erlich  
Reg. No. 24,338  
Attorney for Applicants